

Just as there is a range of possible understandings of the contemporary will-to-art in every period in the history of art [What can be said of the manner in which the contemporary will-to-art that characterizes a given period in the history of art is implemented by the artists of that period? What are the principles of revision/of construction that are utilized by those artists who are interested in and capable of creating works of art in that period in implementing that will-to-art? What is the provenance of the principles of revision/of construction that are utilized by those artists in implementing that will-to-art?] so too there is a range of possible aesthetic distances (the psychical distance between he who is interested in and capable of creating a work of art and a given content for art) from which autonomous-aesthetic phenomena can be created by those who are interested in and capable of doing so. That range comprises all of those psychical distances between on the one hand the stance of the potential creator of forms that are autonomous and aesthetic who has decreased to the utmost the psychical distance between himself and a particular content for art without however allowing distance to disappear (the potential creator is psychically as it were at the threshold of underdistancing were he to decrease his psychical distance further he would not be able to regard dialectically the content for art in question were his psychical distance to be decreased further he would become emotionally involved in that content for art it would hold his attention too much he would be blinded by his first-person perspective) and on the other hand the stance of the potential creator of forms that are autonomous and aesthetic who has increased to the utmost the psychical distance between himself and a particular content for art without however allowing distance to disappear (the potential creator is psychically as it were at the threshold of overdistancing were he to increase his psychical distance further he would be neither interested in nor capable of regarding dialectically the content for art in question were his psychical distance to be increased further the content for art in question would not hold his attention/he would no longer be interested in form-ing/trans-forming a given content for art into a public object/into an autonomous and aesthetic center of meaning which is at the same time meaningful for him as artist qua artist and as artist qua spectator were his psychical distance to be further increased he would begin to regard the content for art in question solely from a third-person perspective. What